



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,424	08/27/2003	Chun Ho Cheung	MS1-1503US	5193
22801 7590 12/12/2007 LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER BECKER, SHASHI KAMALA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,424

Applicant(s)

CHEUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Shashi K. Becker

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li, US Patent 7089500 in view of O'Carroll, US 2003/0093755.

- In regards to claims 1 and 11, Li teaches a method, apparatus and computer-readable medium for presenting a sequence of user interface pages to a user, comprising: page logic associated with an initial user interface page, wherein the page logic is configured to: detect the user's activation of a control provided by the initial user interface page (column 5 lines 14-25); and form a token representative of the activation

of the control; and a navigation module which is configured to: receive the token from the page logic; and determine another user interface page to present to the user by traversing interface pages based on a navigation instruction specified by the token (column 5 lines 26-51). However, Li does not specifically teach a hierarchical tree of nodes representative of the user interface pages in sequence, and traversing the hierarchical tree of nodes; wherein allowing a second hierarchical tree to be plugged into the hierarchical tree, wherein the second hierarchical tree has associated user interface pages, and wherein joining the trees allows user navigation between the sequence of user interface pages and the user interface pages associated with the second hierarchical tree.

O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches a hierarchical tree of nodes representative of the user interface pages in sequence, and traversing the hierarchical tree of nodes (page 8 paragraph [0169] and Figure 7a); wherein allowing a second hierarchical tree to be plugged into the hierarchical tree, wherein the second hierarchical tree has associated user interface pages, and wherein joining the trees allows user navigation between the sequence of user interface pages and the user interface pages associated with the second hierarchical tree (Figure 7 and page 3 paragraphs [0069] and [0070]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of O'Carroll in order to join multiple hierarchical trees. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide for a way to compress documents and collections of documents by eliminating duplication of content.

- In regards to claims 2 and 12, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). Li further teaches wherein the control is configured to instruct the apparatus to advance to a next user interface page (column 5 lines 26-51). However, Li does not specifically teach an interface page with an appropriate node in the hierarchical tree. O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches an interface page with an appropriate node in the hierarchical tree (page 8 paragraph [0169] and Figure 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of O'Carroll in order have interface pages represented as hierarchical tree nodes. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide a way for easy navigation between interface pages.
- In regards to claims 3 and 13, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). Li further teaches wherein the control is configured to instruct the apparatus to advance to a prior user interface page (column 5 lines 26-51). However, Li does not specifically teach an interface page with an associated node in the hierarchical tree. O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches an interface page with an associated node in the hierarchical tree (page 8 paragraph [0169] and Figure 7). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 2 and 12).
- In regards to claims 4 and 14, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). Li further teaches wherein the navigation module further includes history

stack logic configured to record the prior user interface page to provide an indication of the prior user interface page upon activation of the control (column 10 lines 56-65).

- In regards to claims 5 and 15, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the control is configured to instruct the apparatus to advance to one of a plurality of interface pages associated with different respective branching options associated with nodes in the hierarchical tree.

O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches wherein the control is configured to instruct the apparatus to advance to one of a plurality of interface pages associated with different respective branching options associated with nodes in the hierarchical tree (page 8 paragraph [0169] and Figure 7).

It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 2 and 12).

- In regards to claims 6 and 16, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the hierarchical tree includes at least one collection node that includes plural children nodes said at least one collection node and plural children nodes defining a collection of nodes representative of a grouping of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages.

O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches wherein the hierarchical tree includes at least one collection node that includes plural children nodes said at least one collection node and plural children nodes defining a collection of nodes representative (page 2 paragraphs [0035]-[0038]) of a grouping of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages (page 8 paragraph

[0169]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of O'Carroll in order to have a hierarchal representation of interface pages. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to easily navigate through the hierarchal interface pages.

- In regards to claim 7, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). However, Li does not specifically teach wherein a behavior of said at least one collection node is governed by a strategy applied to said at least one collection node. O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches wherein a behavior of said at least one collection node is governed by a strategy applied to said at least one collection node (page 2 paragraphs [0035]-[0038] and Figure 7)) of a grouping of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages (page 8 paragraph [0169]). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 6 and 16).

- In regards to claims 8 and 17, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the strategy is dynamically applied to said at least one collection node.

O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches wherein the strategy is dynamically applied to said at least one collection node (page 2 paragraph [0025]). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 6 and 16).

- In regards to claims 9 and 18, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the strategy defines whether said at least one collection node exhibits a branching behavior or a non-branching behavior.

O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches wherein the strategy defines whether said at least one collection node exhibits a branching behavior or a non-branching behavior (page 3 paragraph [0074]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of O'Carroll in order to have non-branching and branching behavior in hierarchal nodes. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to assign a role in defining the hierarchal tree behavior.

- In regards to claim 10, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). Li further teaches a computer readable medium including machine- readable instructions for implementing the page logic and the navigation module (column 2 lines 42-52).
- In regards to claim 19, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). Li further teaches, wherein the sequence of user interface pages defines a first wizard, and wherein the method further comprises providing another sequence of user interface pages that defines a second wizard, wherein the first and second wizards share at least one user interface page in common (column 5 lines 14-51).

- In regards to claim 20, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). Li further teaches a computer readable medium having machine- readable instructions for implementing each of the detecting, forming, sending, receiving, and traversing (column 5 lines 14-51).
- In regards to claim 21, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). However, Li does not specifically teach a hierarchical tree having nodes that represent a sequence of user interface pages in a wizard, including: at least one collection node that defines a collection of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages, wherein a behavior of said at least one collection node is defined by a strategy applied to said at least one collection node; and at least one page node that directly represents a corresponding user interface page.

O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches a hierarchical tree having nodes that represent a sequence of user interface pages (page 8 paragraph [0169]), including: at least one collection node that defines a collection of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages, wherein a behavior of said at least one collection node is defined by a strategy applied to said at least one collection node; and at least one page node that directly represents a corresponding user interface page (page 2 paragraphs [0035]-[0038]) of a grouping of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages (page 8 paragraph [0169]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of O'Carroll in order to have a hierarchal representation of interface pages. One would have been

motivated to make such a combination in order to easily navigate easily through the hierarchal interface pages.

- In regards to claim 22, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims I and 11 supra). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the strategy applied to said at least one collection node creates non-branching behavior in the collection of user interface pages.

O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches wherein the strategy applied to said at least one collection node creates non-branching behavior in the collection of user interface pages (page 3 paragraph [0074]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of O'Carroll in order to have non-branching and branching behavior in hierarchal nodes. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to assign a role in defining the hierarchal tree behavior.

- In regards to claim 23, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 supra). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the strategy applied to said at least one collection node creates branching behavior in the collection of user interface pages.

O'Carroll teaches a document processing system and method. O'Carroll further teaches wherein the strategy applied to said at least one collection node creates branching behavior in the collection of user interface pages (page 3 paragraph [0074] and Figure 7). It would have been obvious for the same reasons stated above (see claim 22).

Application/Control Number:
10/649,424
Art Unit: 2179

Page 10

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shashi K. Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-8919. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/649,424
Art Unit: 2179

Page 12

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SKB



WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER